

1 E. MARTIN ESTRADA  
2 United States Attorney  
3 MACK E. JENKINS  
4 Assistant United States Attorney  
5 Chief, Criminal Division  
6 JONATHAN GALATZAN  
7 Assistant United States Attorney  
8 Chief, Asset Forfeiture and Recovery Section  
9 RYAN WATERS (Cal. Bar No. 268015)  
10 Assistant United States Attorney  
11 Asset Forfeiture and Recovery Section  
12 1400 United States Courthouse  
13 312 North Spring Street  
14 Los Angeles, California 90012  
15 Telephone: (213) 894-3111  
16 Facsimile: (213) 894-0142  
17 E-mail: ryan.waters@usdoj.gov

18 Attorneys for Plaintiff  
19 United States of America

20 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

21 FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

22 WESTERN DIVISION

23 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

No. 2:24-cv-

24 Plaintiff,

VERIFIED COMPLAINT FOR FORFEITURE

25 v.

18 U.S.C. §§ 981(a)(1)(A) and (C)  
and 984

26 \$509,573.00 IN BANK FUNDS,

[U.S.S.S.]

27 Defendant.

28 Plaintiff United States of America brings this claim against  
defendant \$509,573.00 in Bank Funds, and alleges as follows:

**JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

29 1. The government brings this in rem civil forfeiture action  
30 pursuant to 18 U.S.C. §§ 981(a)(1)(A) and (C) and 984.

31 2. This Court has jurisdiction over the matter pursuant to 28  
32 U.S.C. §§ 1345 and 1355.

3. Venue lies in this district pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1395.

## **PERSONS AND ENTITIES**

4. The plaintiff in this action is the United States of America.

5. The defendant in this action is \$509,573.00 in Bank Funds seized pursuant to a federal seizure warrant on November 21, 2023, from a Bank of America account with the last four digits ending in 0808 ("BofA Account 0808"), held in the name of XULI Trade Limited (the "defendant funds"). The defendant funds were seized at Bank of America, 888 W 7th St., Los Angeles, CA 90017.

6. The defendant funds are currently in the custody of the United States Secret Service ("USSS") in this District, where they will remain subject to this Court's jurisdiction during the pendency of this action.

7. The interests of XULI Trade Limited, Simin Zhu, and the victims identified herein as R.S., Q.L., X.Z., W.L, K.D., Y.C., J.C., M.M., E.D., R.B., T.C., T.G., G.R., and M.K may be adversely affected by these proceedings.

## **BASIS FOR FORFEITURE**

## *Background on Confidence Frauds*

8. A "confidence fraud" involves a victim transferring money and/or property as a result of being deceived or misled by the offender. Often a fraudster deceives a victim into believing they have a close relationship--whether familial, friendly, or romantic--and leverages that relationship to persuade the victim to send money, provide personal and financial information, and/or purchase items of value.

9. Victims of confidence frauds often do not recognize that

1 they are being defrauded for many months or more, and sometimes never  
2 recognize that they have been defrauded, because they are, or believe  
3 they are, in a legitimate relationship with the person making the  
4 false claims or promises to them. Therefore, it is not uncommon to  
5 observe multiple wires and transfers being sent to the same  
6 beneficiary or multiple beneficiaries over a period of time. Some  
7 victims of confidence frauds are not completely truthful with, or  
8 seek to impede law enforcement officers who question them about the  
9 money they have transferred, in part to protect their purported  
10 friend.

11       10. Sometimes digital currency, also known as "crypto  
12 currency," "cryptocurrency" and "virtual currency," is used in  
13 confidence frauds. Digital currency is generally defined as an  
14 electronic-sourced unit of value that can be used as a substitute for  
15 fiat currency (i.e., currency created and regulated by a government),  
16 but unlike fiat currency has no physical form and instead exists  
17 entirely on the internet. In addition, digital currency is generated  
18 and controlled through computer software operating on a decentralized  
19 peer-to-peer network. Digital currency is often used for conducting  
20 illegal transactions or for concealing or disguising the true nature,  
21 source, location, ownership or control of illegally obtained criminal  
22 proceeds. Bitcoin is one of the most commonly used digital  
23 currencies.

24       11. A digital currency exchange (an "exchange") is a brick-and-  
25 mortar or online business that allows customers to trade digital  
26 currencies for fiat currencies or other digital currencies. Most  
27 exchanges are located outside the United States in order to avoid  
28

1 regulation and legal requirements. Coinbase, which operates in the  
2 United States, is one of the largest and most popular exchanges.

3                   *The Law Enforcement Investigation In This Case*

4               12. The USSS has investigated a confidence fraud whereby  
5 multiple victims transferred funds based on fraudulent pretenses into  
6 a Cathay Bank account with the last 4 digits ending in 7373 ("Cathay  
7 Account 7373"). A portion of those funds were ultimately transferred  
8 into BofA Account 0808 from which the defendant funds were seized.  
9 As part of the investigation, the USSS learned the information set  
10 forth below.

11                   *Victim E.D. is Defrauded*

12               13. E.D. was contacted on his LinkedIn account by a woman who  
13 went by the name Xiao Xue or "Sue". Sue stated she was in the garment  
14 business and wanted to enter the construction field, where E.D.  
15 worked. After the initial LinkedIn conversation, most other  
16 conversations took place on the WhatsApp instant messaging service.

17               14. Sue proposed that E.D. invest in cryptocurrency via the  
18 Sundell/FX6 platform and claimed she invested \$200,000 of her own  
19 money. On April 11, 2023, believing he was investing in  
20 cryptocurrency, E.D. transferred \$300,000.00 to Cathay Account 7373.

21               15. E.D. requested to withdraw his funds after the account  
22 value purportedly increased to \$700,000. E.D. was then told to pay  
23 25% of the account balance for British tax purposes. E.D. refused to  
24 pay this tax fee and was told his account was frozen. E.D. filed a  
25 police report with the Okaloosa County Sheriff's Office as he  
26 believed he was a victim of fraud.

27  
28

*Victim M.M. is Defrauded*

16. M.M. was contacted via Facebook direct messaging by a woman who went by the name Yuan Yuan Chen ("Chen"). All correspondence between M.M. and Chen was through Facebook, via email or speaking via cell phone.

17. Chen eventually convinced M.M. to invest funds in Cornix.com, a purported cryptocurrency trading platform. Chen told M.M. that she would invest \$1,000,000 of her own money to get him started. On April 11, 2023, believing that he was making a cryptocurrency investment with Cornix.com, M.M. transferred \$100,000 to Cathay Account 7373. M.M. received an account number when he made the wire transfer to Cornix.com.

18. M.M. began to grow suspicious of his dealings with Chen and attempted to withdraw his investment but was told to provide an additional \$600,000.00. M.M. was threatened that his account would be closed and that his investments would be sold. The individual who made these threats did not provide their name or phone number. M.M. began to believe he was defrauded when the individual made the request for additional funds and when the individual provided him with an upfront state income tax form from Colorado, which was spelled incorrectly. Ultimately, M.M. didn't send more funds. M.M. said his account with Cornix.com is now closed and that he no longer has access to the funds.

### *Victim Y.C. is Defrauded*

19. Y.C. was contacted on X, formally known as Twitter, by a woman who went by the name "Lucy".

20. Lucy eventually convinced Y.C. to invest \$33,000.00 in a purported cryptocurrency trading platform called Astro EX. On April 11, 2023, believing that she was making a cryptocurrency investment with Astro EX, Y.C. transferred \$33,000 to Cathay Account 7373. Astro EX has since changed to zbnasz.com.

21. After investing her funds, Y.C. checked her current account earnings, which showed a purported balance of \$2,597,981.13. Y.C. attempted to withdraw her funds but was unsuccessful. Y.C. has made numerous attempts to get in contact with Lucy via phone and via X. Y.C. has been unable to get in touch with Lucy or anyone else to assist her with withdrawing her investment and no longer has access to the funds.

### *Victim R.B. is Defrauded*

22. R.B., on an investment website, was contacted by a woman who said she was born in Korea but raised in Malaysia.

23. R.B. was directed by this individual to setup an account with EliteCMF.com, a purported trading platform, with account number 170414. On April 11, 2023, believing he was making a cryptocurrency investment with EliteCMF.com, R.B. transferred \$70,100.00 to Cathay Account 7373.

24. R.B. checked his account balance on EliteCMF.com and learned his initial investment of \$70,100.00 purportedly increased in value to over \$1,000,000. When the value was later decreasing, he was asked to increase his investment by \$500,000. R.B. did not send additional funds to EliteCMF.com and no longer has access to the

1 funds.

2                   Tracing Fraud Proceeds into BofA Account 0808

3       25. The following fraudulent proceeds, described above, were  
4 deposited into Cathay Account 7373:

- 5                   a. On April 11, 2023, a \$100,000.00 wire from victim  
6                   M.M.;
- 7                   b. On April 11, 2023, a \$33,000.00 wire from victim Y.C.;
- 8                   c. On April 11, 2023, a \$70,100.00 wire from victim R.B.;
- 9                   and
- 10                  d. On April 11, 2023, a \$300,000.00 wire from victim E.D.

11       26. In addition, the USSS has identified 9 additional  
12 suspicious deposits into Cathay Account 7373 but has been  
13 unsuccessful in contacting and interviewing the individuals  
14 associated with the suspicious deposits/transfers and believed to be  
15 victims of this scheme. These other presumed victims made  
16 \$452,582.00 in suspicious deposits into Cathay Account 7373 (the  
17 "Additional Deposits").

18       27. The Additional Deposits share similarities with the above-  
19 described fraud victim transfers into Cathay Account 7373, in that  
20 they (1) were made in the same time period as the above-described  
21 transfers of fraud proceeds; (2) were made from individuals in  
22 locations throughout the United States without the kind of geographic  
23 patterns that might be expected from a legitimate business; (3) were  
24 made from people who had not previously deposited funds in Cathay  
25 Account 7373; and (4) were made in large round-dollar amounts, which

1 are inconsistent with normal business transfers (which typically  
2 reflect taxes and other costs). Accordingly, the Additional Deposits  
3 are also fraud proceeds from victims of this scheme.

4       28. On May 22, 2023, BofA Account 0808 received tainted funds  
5 from Cathay Account 7373 when a \$509,583.00 cashier's check drawn on  
6 Cathay Account 7373 was deposited into BofA Account 0808. Therefore,  
7 the defendant funds seized by the government from BofA Account 0808  
8 represent traceable fraud proceeds.  
9

**FIRST CLAIM FOR RELIEF**

11           29. Based on the facts set out above, plaintiff United States  
12 of America alleges that the defendant funds constitute or are derived  
13 from proceeds traceable to violations of 18 U.S.C. § 1343 (wire  
14 fraud), which is a specified unlawful activity as defined in 18  
15 U.S.C. §§ 1956(c)(7)(A) and 1961(1). The defendant funds are  
16 therefore subject to forfeiture pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 981(a)(1)(C).  
17 In addition, to the extent that the defendant funds are not the  
18 actual monies directly traceable to the illegal activity identified  
19 herein, plaintiff alleges that the defendant funds are identical  
20 property found in the same account or place as the property involved  
21 in the specified offense, rendering the defendant funds subject to  
22 forfeiture pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 984.

## **SECOND CLAIM FOR RELIEF**

24       30. Based on the facts set out above, plaintiff United States  
25 of America alleges that the defendant funds constitute property  
26 involved in multiple transactions or attempted transactions in  
27 violation of 18 U.S.C. § 1956(a)(1)(B)(i), or property traceable to  
28 such property, with the specified unlawful activity being a violation

1 of 18 U.S.C. § 1343 (wire fraud). The defendant funds are therefore  
2 subject to forfeiture pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 981(a)(1)(A). In  
3 addition, to the extent that the defendant funds are not the actual  
4 monies directly traceable to the illegal activity identified herein,  
5 plaintiff alleges that the defendant funds are identical property  
6 found in the same account or place as the property involved in the  
7 specified offense, rendering the defendant funds subject to  
8 forfeiture pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 984.

**THIRD CLAIM FOR RELIEF**

10       31. Based on the facts set out above, plaintiff United States  
11 of America alleges that the defendant funds constitute property  
12 involved in multiple transactions or attempted transactions in  
13 violation of 18 U.S.C. § 1957(a), or property traceable to such  
14 property, with the specified unlawful activity being a violation of  
15 18 U.S.C. § 1343 (wire fraud). The defendant funds are therefore  
16 subject to forfeiture pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 981(a)(1)(A). In  
17 addition, to the extent that the defendant funds are not the actual  
18 monies directly traceable to the illegal activity identified herein,  
19 plaintiff alleges that the defendant funds are identical property  
20 found in the same account or place as the property involved in the  
21 specified offense, rendering the defendant funds subject to  
22 forfeiture pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 984.

WHEREFORE, plaintiff United States of America prays that:

24                 (a) due process issue to enforce the forfeiture of the  
25 defendant funds;

26 (b) due notice be given to all interested parties to appear and  
27 show cause why forfeiture should not be decreed;

(c) this Court decree forfeiture of the defendant funds to the

1 United States of America for disposition according to law; and  
2 (d) for such other and further relief as this Court may deem  
3 just and proper, together with the costs and disbursements of this  
4 action.

5 Dated: January 22, 2024

E. MARTIN ESTRADA  
United States Attorney  
MACK E. JENKINS  
Assistant United States Attorney  
Chief, Criminal Division  
JONATHAN GALATZAN  
Assistant United States Attorney  
Chief, Asset Forfeiture and Recovery  
Section

11 */s/ Ryan Waters*  
RYAN WATERS  
12 Assistant United States Attorney

13 Attorneys for Plaintiff  
14 United States of America

15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

## VERIFICATION

I, Fred Apodaca, hereby declare that:

1. I am a Special Agent with the United States Secret Service.

2. I have read the above Verified Complaint for Forfeiture and its contents. It is based upon my own personal knowledge and facts provided to me by other law enforcement agents.

3. Everything contained in the Complaint is true and correct, to the best of my knowledge and belief.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed January 16, 2024 in Los Angeles, California.

Fred Apod

**FRED APODACA**  
Special Agent